

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 6, 1933

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1933, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, January 6, 1933. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Cross,
Mr. Weinman,
Mr. Mauran,
Mr. Clarke,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting, held November 18 and 19, were approved.

2. AIR MAIL FLYERS MEDAL OF HONOR: Mr. Weinman presented a model for the obverse of the Air Mail Flyers Medal of Honor, received by him from Mr. Walker Hancock, sculptor; also a design for the reverse of the medal, bearing the inscription. Mr. Weinman regarded the model very well executed and upon his recommendation the Commission approved both the model and the design. (Exhibit A; see also A-1, approving the model for the reverse.)

3. FORT RENO HIGH SCHOOL PLAN: Under date of December 23, 1932, the following letter was received from Major J. C. Gotwals, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, with regard to the revised plans that have been prepared for the Fort Reno High School:

Honorable Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Moore:

I have read your letter of December 15th in reference to the plans for the Fort Reno High School and am writing this letter so that you might appreciate my difficulties in the situation relating to these plans and if possible generously help me through them.

Mr. Harris has been submitting to the Fine Arts Commission various plans since September last. The School Board is at the same time very insistent that the construction of this school be expedited. Mr. Harris, in his final plans submitted to you, believed he had responded to your most worthwhile suggestions for economy in adjusting the buildings to the ground. In these final plans he received the endorsement of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

In accordance with instructions of Congress, it essentially follows the plan of the Roosevelt High School. This feature has been very insistently demanded by the House Appropriation Committee. You realize that our authorized expenditures for plans are very sharply limited to percentages running to between 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ % and 3% by Congressional authorization. The creation of a deficiency in preparing plans due to irritation of Congress in the past, in the case of similar deficiencies creates such a troublesome situation that it must not be brought up. You refer to the liberality of the appropriation for plans for this school. In reality such liberality does not exist as under the authorized amount for this school now prescribed in the Budget submitted to Congress only \$40,000 at the outside will be available for plans and inspection. It might even be less.

The delay in securing an approved general plan for the school has already added seriously to our architectural costs. You will realize that all of the street grades adjacent to the proposed building have been established. The plans now presented are carefully adjusted to the established grades of Chesapeake Street. I do not believe any further topographic information will alter the vertical location of the building. At the same time, I am appreciative of the need for more detailed topographic information for the proper development of the grounds. With this in view, the District Surveyor is preparing a chart with a contour interval of 2 feet, showing all of the culture on the site. This will be used in the development of the grounds, but after inspecting our present information, I do not see how it can possibly affect the vertical or horizontal location of the building group.

I could not defend before Congress the employment of any additional engineering services in this respect for this work. I am now wondering if you will consider the various viewpoints impinging upon the District Commissioners, especially those set by law which are mandatory and whether you will not approve the general layout given by Mr. Harris, so that we can proceed with our building design and be prepared to receive a detailed layout of the grounds when the topographic map supplementing our present information is at hand. In view of our fiscal relation to Congress, I am forced to be

exceedingly careful in the expenditure of funds for architectural design and cannot, without a release from Congress, digress essentially from the general plan of the Roosevelt High School, which we are following.

In view of all this, would you not be good enough to give your approval of our plans.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) John C. Gotwals,
Major, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army,
Engineer Commissioner.

The Commission noted that Major Gotwals did not wish to have the project further delayed and desired to have the plans approved by the Commission.

The Commission again inspected the plans. Attention was called to the letter addressed to Major Gotwals on December 15, (Exhibit B), in which the Commission had informed him that they recognized an improvement in the revised plans but felt still further improvement could be made in them. The Commission expressed regret that the plans were prepared before an adequate study had been made of the lay-out with reference to the topography. Major Clarke said had this been done and a small model made of the group of buildings to be built, he was certain a saving of many times the cost of the topographical study and the preparation of the model could have been effected. Major Clarke said also that to try to adapt the facade of a building to an 8 per cent grade was not the way to design a building.

Mr. Eliot of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission said that their Commission had approved the plans with the suggestion that more space be allowed between the school building and the auditorium.

A report was sent to Major Gotwals approving the plans but advising that in the future careful study should be made of the topography before plans for a school building are prepared by the Municipal Architect. (Exhibit B-1; see also B-7)

4. NEW POWER PLANT OF THE POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY: The Potomac Electric Power Company submitted plans for their new power plant to be erected at Buzzard's Point in Southwest Washington about three blocks east of the War College. This structure is to take the place of the old power plant that stood in the Triangle and had to be removed for the new Government Buildings.

The Commission inspected the plans, which were designed by Georges R. Wyren, architect, and the Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation of Boston, Massachusetts.

The Commission had previously protested against a 225-foot smokestack. This had been reduced to 140 feet. The building is to be of brick and it was proposed to use cast stone for the base and ornament. The Commission expressed their preference for limestone on account of its better weathering qualities and appearance. Mr. Mauran and Mr. Cross stated that it has been their experience that after a few years cast stone takes on a dull color. The building will be 265 feet square and 90 feet high. It represents an investment of about \$5,000,000. In general the Commission regarded the plans well designed and approved them. (Exhibit C)

The Secretary stated that a few days ago he visited the site and found that the company has begun work on the foundations. Also he called attention to the Act approving the industrial development of Buzzard's Point, which provides:

(Public No. 187--72d Congress) "That the plans for any building fronting on Canal Street from the Anacostia River to F Street southwest shall have the approval of the Fine Arts Commission as to height and design." (Approved, June 10, 1932.)

The new power plant will not face Canal Street, but the Secretary stated that he had conferred with the President of the Potomac Electric Power Company about the matter and he had expressed a desire to have the advice of the Commission as to the plans.

5. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN MEMORIAL LANDSCAPE PLAN: The William Jennings Bryan Memorial Association through their representative, Mr. D. Sutton, landscape architect, submitted a landscape plan for the William Jennings Bryan Memorial to be erected along the Rock Creek Parkway about 150 feet north of Constitution Avenue near the Lincoln Memorial. The design was brought to the attention of Mr. Clarke, who after inspecting the design disapproved it. Mr. Clarke said the design lacks dignity and simplicity and is too fussy and informal. He also believed that the scale is not in keeping with the whole composition. Mr. Mauran thought the design had no vigor.

Mr. Clarke advised that the plan should have for its main features simply pavement, trees and grass with possibly a few box bushes; that the central portion of the plaza should be flat so as to give emphasis to the architectural features of the composition and at the same time give it a feeling of unity.

The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission the following telegram received from Mr. Gutzon Borglum, protesting against concrete piling for the monument:

January 5, 1923.

M. F. Guenther, Esq.,
Secretary, Joint War Commission,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

Sutton will present complete proposals for putting around Bryan Statue. It has been proposed that concrete piling be put under base. I believe this not only unnecessary expense but less safe than spreading concrete. Of course - shall follow the decision of the Commission and Department. Greetings to you.

Gutzon Borglum.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, who was present, said that West Potomac Park is filled land and it has been the experience of his office that when monuments are erected on such ground, piling for the foundations is very necessary. Colonel Grant called attention to the fact that the Lincoln Memorial terrace wall settled as much as a foot and a foot and a half before the underpinning. Also, the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission had found that on the west side of the Lincoln Memorial the pavement had settled from 8 inches in some places to 14 inches in others, from the time the area was paved about 9 years ago. The John Ericsson Memorial was built on piles but has tilted a little. Unfortunately there are no funds to straighten it.

Mr. Clarke prepared a pencil sketch for a revised plan, which was brought to the attention of Mr.utton. Mr.utton in cooperation with the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks will prepare a new landscape plan embodying Mr. Clarke's suggestions and present it to the Commission. Mr. Clarke also suggested that a cross section be made in connection with the landscape plan for proper consideration of grading. It was the opinion of Mr. Clarke that the base of the monument might well be slightly higher than the road curb and have a slight incline from the Constitution Avenue side. (Exhibit D)

6. SUCCESSOR TO EZRA WINTER: As the four-year term of service of Mr. Ezra Winter has expired the Commission considered a successor to him and unanimously agreed to suggest Professor Eugene Savage of the School of Fine Arts, New Haven, Connecticut.

7. SUCCESSOR TO JOHN W. CROSS: As the four-year term of service of Mr. John W. Cross has expired, the Commission unanimously agreed to suggest Mr. Charles A. Coolidge, of Boston, for appointment as architect member of the Commission.

8. SUCCESSOR TO A. A. WEINMAN: As the four-year term of service of Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor member of the Commission, will expire in February 1933, the Commission considered a successor to Mr. Weinman and unanimously agreed to suggest Mr. Lee Lavrie, sculptor, of New York City, for appointment. Mr. Weinman said he regarded Mr. Lavrie as the most experienced sculptor that could be appointed for membership on the Commission at this time.

9. MURAL DECORATIONS, BICENTENNIAL FINE ARTS EXHIBITION: The Secretary stated that Dr. A. Wetmore, Secretary in Charge of the Smithsonian Institution, had urged that the mural decorations be taken down. Mr. Weinman asked if Dr. Wetmore had agreed to release the National Sculpture Society from restoring the partitions, whereupon Dr. Wetmore was consulted by telephone and he stated that he would release the National Sculpture Society from further responsibility in this matter and would confirm this in writing. (Exhibit E) Thereupon Mr. Weinman in behalf of the National Sculpture Society authorized the acceptance of a bid received from the Capital Awning Company to take down the mural decorations and pack them. Mr. Weinman, however, specified that the amount should not exceed \$800. (This was agreed to by the Capitol Awning Company. Exhibit E-1)

The Secretary stated that when the mural paintings are properly packed, he would arrange to return them to the Mural Painters Society, 115 East 40th Street, New York City, by American Railway Express.

10. SIGN FOR CANTON PAGODA RESTAURANT: Under date of December 23, 1932, the following letter was received from Hon. Millard E. Tydings, U. S. Senate, submitting a communication (Exhibit F) received by him from the Neon Lighting Company of Maryland, urging the erection of a neon sign on the Canton Pagoda Restaurant, 1347 E Street, N. W., as follows:

Dear Mr. Gaemmerer:

The firm of Claude Neon Lights of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland, has been experiencing some difficulty relative to placing certain signs in the City of Washington.

This firm has operated in Washington with a branch office and full maintenance force for the past four years and the officials of the firm advise me they are familiar with the regulations pertaining to the placing of signs in the District.

Two of these signs are for the Canton Pagoda Restaurant and the other for the Liberty Theatre Company.

I am enclosing herewith a letter which I have today from the president of the above-mentioned concern and from this I note that the Liberty Theatre Company sign is no longer a live issue, but they are setting forth certain facts with reference to the ones for the Canton Pagoda. Recently the president of the Board of Commissioners advised me that your Commission had disapproved this application.

Will you please be so kind as to note what is said in the attached letter regarding this matter, advising me if it would be possible, in view thereof, to re-consider this question?

Very truly yours,
(Signed) M. E. Tydings.

The Secretary stated that the Commission had disapproved the application on ~~November 2, 1931~~ ^{January 20, 1932}, because it involved a three-foot projection. The matter was very carefully considered by the Commission, which decided that since Congress of its own initiative originated the legislation and passed the Shipstead-Luce Act, approved May 16, 1930, which provides for improving the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue opposite the new public buildings, the Commission in order to be consistent has done everything possible to quiet that area and give it dignity in keeping with the Government buildings, and is now endeavoring to carry out the provisions of the act. The sign proposed is very objectionable not only because it is bright but also because it would extend three feet beyond the building line. The Commission having made an absolute rule not to approve applications involving projections,

the Commission could not approve this application. Senator Fdings was informed accordingly. (Exhibit F-1)

11. GAS STATION AT 27TH AND F STREETS, N. W.: The secretary brought the following letter received from Mr. William H. Linkins, in regard to the proposed gas station at 27th and F Streets, N. W., to the attention of the Commission:

January 3, 1933.

Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Attention of the Chairman

Gentlemen:

As agent for Mrs. Charlotte T. Cumberland, owner of a life estate in Lot 5 Square 10, which lot is at the southeast corner of 27th and F Street, facing the river, I requested Mr. William I. Deming to make up plans for a gas station on this lot which is properly zoned for that purpose. I requested Mr. Deming to file his plans with your Commission which I understand he has done and that his plans have been informally approved.

I gather from Mr. Deming that the reason you have not finally approved the plans is that you desire to discourage in every way within your power the use of that land at that point for a gas station. If that is true, or whether or not it is true, I would like to appear at your meeting on next Friday and present from the owner's standpoint her situation with respect to this land.

I hope that my appearance before your Commission is consistent with the rules of your body and also with the rights of my client as an owner of real estate who may be affected adversely by such action as you may take in the premises.

Very truly yours,
H. L. R. (Signed) Wm. H. Linkins.

The Commission considered the subject of erecting a gas station along the Rock Creek Parkway and in this connection also considered a letter from Colonel Grant on the subject. (Exhibit G) The Commission expressed regret

that the projects could not be kept in absolute control and emphasized the importance of changing the zoning regulations in the locality so as not to permit further industrial development there. Mr. Moore said he thought the time has come when Washington should do as is being done in New York as to locating gas stations within certain areas. Mr. Clarke said that gas stations are not permitted on Fifth Avenue but provision is made for erecting them at designated points adjacent to Fifth Avenue. The Commission felt that as to the complaint made by Mr. Linkins regarding disposal of the land in question this is not a matter under their jurisdiction.

The Commission again inspected the sketches prepared by Mr. Deming for the gas station and regarded them interesting. The Commission said that if Mr. Deming will present more complete drawings, the Commission will inspect them at a future meeting. He is to submit his drawings to the Building Inspector as required by the Shipstead-Luce Act before submitting them to the Commission of Fine Arts. (Exhibit G-1)

12. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT REGULATIONS: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission a list of the houses suggested by Mr. Donn and Mr. Peaslee, prints of several of which will be published with the Shipstead-Luce Act Regulations. Mr. Mauran thought the houses Mr. Donn had suggested were too formal and too elaborate while Mr. Peaslee's were in the opposite direction and suggested the type of house that is usually seen in subdivisions. Mr. Moore said there should be a residence between the embassy building and houses suggested by Mr. Peaslee. Mr. Mauran wondered why there should not be some of the big houses as suggested by Mr. Donn, which would be used only as ideal types of houses--something to inspire the architects.

Later in the day Mr. Donn and Mr. Peaslee conferred with the Commission regarding the matter. Mr. Peaslee felt that the Commission should publish a photograph of some well designed row houses with well designed backs, particularly, because the backs of these houses often look over Rock Creek Park. He suggested some of the houses in Foxhall Village as being desirable. Mr. Moore suggested that the houses on the park should be like the old Virginia houses, which had both front and back well designed. Mr. Donn thought some of the houses between Rock Creek Park and Woodley Road and Rock Creek Park Estates would be desirable models. Colonel Grant suggested Colonial Village and the houses along Belmont Street. Mr. Peaslee believed that any architect's work which is published should not include the name of the architect and the Commission concurred in this.

Mr. Moore thought it would be desirable that the plan for the grounds surrounding the houses should also be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts. Major Clarke agreed with Mr. Moore that the grounds, garage and surroundings of the houses are very important matters. Colonel Grant asked whether it would not be well to put into the regulations a requirement that the surroundings of the house as well as the house should come under the control of the Commission.

The Commission endorsed the recommendation of Mr. Hauran that the following residences be selected tentatively by the Commission for illustrations to accompany the Shipstead-Luce Act Regulations:

- Hitt House.
- Townsend House.
- Japanese Embassy.
- Bliss House.
- Houses on Colony Hill by Mr. Peaslee. (Cards 1 and 2)
- Two or three houses from those between Rock Creek Park and Woodley Road.

No architect's name is to be mentioned but the architect's permission must be obtained in advance for the omission.

13. ARLINGTON CEMETERY REGULATIONS: In connection with a proposed revision of the regulations for Arlington National Cemetery, the Commission had before them copies of the Fort Lincoln and Arlington Cemetery Regulations. Mr. Moore said that Arlington National Cemetery since the Amphitheatre has been built and the Arlington Mansion restored, has become more or less of a park and should be made orderly. Major Clarke said with reference to the regulations that he believes the stones should all be very simple excepting the stones for those above the rank of Major General, which should be considered separately. Mr. Moore thought the ideal for Arlington is the uniform small stone and although it is a hard thing to bring about, the Commission should urge it in the extension of the cemetery. He also believed that it is necessary to consider the fact that some officers families can afford a fine monument whereas some can not. Mr. Weinman felt that the uniform small stone, which would give orderliness to the cemetery, should appeal to the officers, but admitted that there is the matter of family pride to be reckoned with. Mr. Moore said Thomas Hastings, the architect of the Arlington Amphitheatre, had thought the columns in the Amphitheatre could be used for inscriptions and memorials. The crypt of the Amphitheatre has also never been used.

The Commission concluded that the Secretary should make a copy of the regulations, embodying the suggestions made by the Commission in the letters from the different members regarding the regulations.

14. THE MALL AND MONUMENT GARDENS: Mr. Moore reported that reports received by him from the members of the Commission as to planting four rows

of elms in the Mall were practically unanimous on the subject. In this respect the Plan of 1901 is sustained. Major Clarke handed the Chairman a letter received from Professor Hubbard, member of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, indicating that that Commission had not changed its official decision on the subject, concurring in the planting of the four rows of elm trees. (Exhibit E)

15. SCULPTURE FOR THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Colonel Grant brought to the attention of the Commission the following letter addressed by him to the Commission, bringing to their attention a request made by Leo Friedlander, sculptor, that the time specified in his contract for executing the equestrian groups at the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge be extended 100 days:

January 6, 1933.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: ALE Contract No. 56, delay claimed by
Sculptor on account of changes in sketch
model after signing of contract.

My dear Mr. Moore:

In connection with Mr. Friedlander's contract with this Commission covering the design and erection of the equestrian groups at the entrance to the Memorial Bridge, I have had a considerable amount of correspondence and conference with him relative to delays which he claims were occasioned to him by reason of changes in the 1/16th size (sketch) models after the signing of his contract.

You will recall our contract with both Mr. Friedlander and Mr. Fraser provides that the 1/16th size models were to be approved prior to the signing of the contract. Indeed, the approval of these sketch models was a condition precedent to the closing of the contracts with the sculptors. I have a letter from your Commission dated prior to the date of the contract stating that the models were satisfactory to you.

Mr. Friedlander now states that after the signing of the contract, certain changes were requested by the Commission of Fine Arts which were of so radical a nature (he refers to them as major changes in the models) that he demurred on the ground that the changes would react to the detriment of his conception. He also states that the Commission of Fine Arts, who it appears had requested the changes for architectural reasons concerned with the balancing of the pairs or groups at the entrance to the Memorial Bridge and the Parkway Underpass, respectively, withdrew their request for changes, apparently being convinced that the changes requested were not of an essential nature; or at least not important enough to necessitate a change in Mr. Friedlander's design.

As a result of these negotiations, Mr. Friedlander states that he was delayed by about 100 days. He also feels that the magnitude of the changes requested were such as to render them somewhat outside of the usual and accepted practice adhered to in retouching and modifying models during the course of development of the full size models. In any event, he feels that inasmuch as the Commission of Fine Arts receded in some measure, from the requests made at first and acquiesced in his pleas that they be minimized, the allowance of the delay is due to him in accordance with the usages of his profession.

I shall not burden you by presenting a full account of my correspondence with Mr. Friedlander on this subject, but present this letter at this time merely to get it before your Commission, and if possible to avoid extended negotiations. Please understand that I desire to be entirely fair with the sculptors and allow them every possible consideration, as I realize that their work is exacting and tedious. However, I can not recommend extensions of time without tangible reasons.

If your commission feels that Mr. Friedlander is entitled to an extension of time for the reasons above stated (and in this connection I would not be fair if I did not add that he has been very temperate in his requests and explanations), I will be glad if you will advise me to that effect, stating the inclusive dates within which he was delayed by your negotiations with him.

Mr. Nagle has conferred informally with Mr. Weinman relative to these claims and I believe the latter is fairly familiar with them. If you desire a full record of these negotiations, I shall of course be glad to furnish you with them.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) W. C. Grant, 3d,
Lieut. Col., Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,
Executive Officer.

The Commission after consideration decided that Mr. Friedlander's request was reasonable and agreed to recommend an extension of the time in Mr. Friedlander's contract to cover a period somewhat over 100 days, namely, from September 25, 1931, to January 19, 1932. It was during this period that a study was made by Mr. Friedlander of his models to bring them into proper proportion with the Arlington Memorial Bridge and otherwise make them appropriate as equestrian groups at the entrance to the bridge. A report was sent to Colonel Grant. (Exhibit I)

16. BRIDGE OVER B STREET SOUTH CONNECTING AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Mr. Louis M. Simon of the Office of the Supervising Architect, submitted to the Commission a design for a single arch to cross B Street South, which is to connect the Administration Building with the extensible building on the south side of B Street South. Mr. Eliot of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission said that their Commission had not favored the design which Mr. Simon was preparing since it would mean that the pier at the north end would block the vista looking down from the Capitol, when that street is widened. Mr. Eliot submitted a sketch showing the studies by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission of this project. One of the studies suggested a steel arch.

The Commission decided that the bridge should be built of stone. The Commission also decided that the crossing should consist of two arches. A report suggesting that a new design be prepared embodying these suggestions was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury. (Exhibit J)

17. LANDSCAPE PLAN, COLUMBIA ISLAND: Major Clark presented a sketch he had made for Columbia Island and the Commission inspected this design

with interest. The design suggested two large pools on Columbia Island Plaza. These the Commission regarded much more restful than the columns that had been proposed by Mr. Kendall. The design is to be considered with Mr. Kendall at the next meeting of the Commission.

18. PROPOSED PURCHASES BY THE FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission inspected a number of works of art proposed for purchase by Mr. John Lodge, Curator, for the Freer Gallery of Art. The Commission inspected them with great interest and approved the purchase of the objects shown on the appended list. (Exhibit E)

19. THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Secretary stated that Mr. Ezra Winter had suggested that the Commission inspect his paintings for the George Rogers Clark Memorial at the meeting in New York in February. The Commission accordingly decided to hold their meeting in New York City on Friday, February 17. Mr. Mauran stated he was sailing for Europe the day following to be gone at least three months. (Mr. Moore subsequently having decided to take a trip to Mexico, leaving New York City, January 30, and returning February 21, decided that the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts should be held in New York City, Thursday, February 23, instead of February 17.)

The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p. m. The Commission had as their guests at luncheon, Colonel Grant, Major Gillette, Mr. Elliot, Mr. Hagle, Mr. Dorn and Mr. Teaslee.

C O P Y

January 7, 1933.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, 1933, approved the model for the obverse of the Air Mail Flyers' Medal of Honor by Walker Hancock, Sculptor, of New York City. Also, the Commission approved the design for the reverse of the medal.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

The Honorable
The Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL
WASHINGTON

January 9, 1933.

RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JAN 11 1933
NOTED

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

Reference is made to your memorandum of January 9, transmitting a blueprint of the reverse of the air mail flyers' medal of honor, and asking if this meets with the approval of the Post Office Department.

In reply you are advised that the design indicated on the blueprint transmitted by your office meets with our approval.

It is noted the sculptor has submitted a model for the obverse of the medal and that the same has been approved. It is suggested the sculptor submit his model of the reverse of the medal promptly in order that there may be no further delay in the matter.

Very truly yours,



W. Irving Glover,

Second Assistant
Postmaster General.

10-200000000
2-12-33 A

C O P Y

January 24, 1933.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the model for the reverse of the Air Mail Flyer's Medal of Honor, by Walker Hancock, Sculptor, of New York City.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable

The Postmaster General,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A-1

C O P Y

ENGINEER COMMISSIONER
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Washington

January 11, 1937.

My dear Mr. Moore:

I have your letter of January 7, 1937, telling me that the Commission of Fine Arts have approved the revised design of the buildings for the Fort Reno High School. I appreciate this most deeply.

I will lend every aid that is in my power to the most worthy objective you point out - to fit our school buildings as economically as may be possible to the ground on which they stand.

With very kindest regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) John C. Gutzals,

Major Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,

Engineer Commissioner.

Hon. Charles Moore,
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

111111 3-3

U G 1 Y

January 7, 1933.

My dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 3, 1933, approved the design for the new power plant of the Potomac Electric Power Company, to be built at Buzzard's Point.

The Commission suggest the use of limestone, if not for the entire structure, at least for the lower portions of the building, where the cost would be little if any greater than the cast stone. It is the experience of the architects on the Commission that cast stone does not have good weathering qualities. In a few years it takes on a dead appearance. In the case of the use of limestone the ornament, of course, would be modified.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. William F. Mann, President,
Potomac Electric Power Company,
Washington, D. C.

RECEIVED

COPY

January 11, 1933.

My dear Mr. Borglum:

Enclosed is a copy of a telegram which I sent to you today at San Antonio, Texas, informing you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 6, considered the landscape plan for the William Jennings Bryan Memorial, submitted in your behalf by Mr. Sutton, and made a number of suggestions which will be embodied in a revised plan.

I brought your telegram as to the memorial to the attention of the Commission. Representatives of the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks reported that due to the fact that West Potomac Park is filled land, it will be necessary to use concrete piling to support the memorial.

We hope to receive the revised landscape plan within the next two weeks and it will be given special attention by the Commission as soon as submitted.

During the visit of Mrs. Borglum to the office recently I mentioned to her the desirability of having a photograph of the full sized model and if possible, of the statue itself. I am continually receiving inquiries for photographs.

I take it the William Jennings Bryan Memorial Association will decide on a date of dedication some time early in the spring. We are having unusually mild weather and I hope it will hold good for most of the rest of the winter.

Very cordially yours,

(Signed) H. E. Caspary,

Secretary.

Mr. Gutzon Borglum,
Stamford, Connecticut.

ENCLOSURE

EXHIBITION OF WORKS OF THE FINE ARTS

Mr. Fess presented the following

LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TO THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED STATES GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION RELATIVE TO AN EXHIBITION OF FINE ARTS SHOWN IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM BUILDING AND THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, MARCH 26 TO NOVEMBER 24, 1932

JANUARY 10 (calendar day, JANUARY 19), 1933.—Ordered to be printed

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, January 14, 1933.

Hon. SIMEON D. FESS,
*Vice Chairman George Washington Bicentennial Commission,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR FESS: The George Washington Bicentennial Commission having asked the Commission of Fine Arts to arrange an exhibition of works of the fine arts suited to the occasion of the bicentennial, this commission secured the active cooperation of the National Sculpture Society, the National Society of Mural Painters, the American Academy in Rome, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Harvard University School of Landscape Architecture professors who were engaged on topographic studies of Mount Vernon. Other art organizations gave encouragement to the project but were not in financial position to participate in the exhibition.

The great rotunda of the National Museum Building and exhibition rooms of the National Gallery of Art were courteously granted by the Smithsonian Institution and were especially prepared for the exhibition, the expense being borne partly by an appropriation by Congress and partly by the National Sculpture Society, which undertook the general supervision of the arrangements.

The exhibition was opened on March 26, 1932, and continued until November 24, 1932, during which period it was visited by 448,627 people.

The larger portion of the works of sculpture shown naturally came from members of the National Sculpture Society, but were not limited to those members. For artistic excellence and also for the

number of works, the exhibition was representative of American sculpture.

Three models of statues of historic significance and high merit by sculptors no longer living were shown. John Quincy Adams Ward's standing figure of Washington from the subtreasury in New York; Daniel Chester French's statue of the Republic (in bronze) from Chicago; and Paul Bartlett's equestrian statue of Lafayette from Paris.

The Mural Painters contributed a series of scenes from the life of George Washington, painted on large canvases that made a complete frieze around the main exhibition room. These murals formed a feature of first importance. They represented both in the labor bestowed upon them and also in the talent displayed by the painters the manifestation of a patriotic spirit of significance and value.

The American Academy in Rome contributed a series of large photographs presenting the executed work in architecture, sculpture, and landscape architecture of the graduates of that institution, which was chartered by Congress.

The drawings and topographic surveys of Mount Vernon, Woodlawn, and Gunston Hall, the first of the kind ever made, were of importance both as representations of early landscape work, and also from the standpoint of the cultural history of this country.

The exhibition made by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission well occupied as large a space as the exhibition of sculpture. It presented in models, renderings, plans, and photographs a record of the development of the City of Washington as the National Capital, past, present, and future.

It is not possible to mention here the names of the persons who gave time and thought to make the exhibition a serious, sustained, and a (within the limits above mentioned) representative exhibition of the culture of the American people. In the language of Thomas Jefferson, "its object was to improve the taste of our countrymen, to increase their reputation, to reconcile to them the respect of the world and procure them its praise." This object the exhibition accomplished.

Very respectfully yours,

CHARLES MOORE, *Chairman.*



COPY

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
Washington, U.S.A.

January 11, 1938.

Mr. Adolph A. Weinman,
c/o Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Weinman:

At the conclusion of the special exhibit arranged for the
bicentennial period under the auspices of the Fine Arts
Commission, I beg to say that after due consideration the
Smithsonian Institution waives that part of our original agree-
ment with you that required the replacement of certain partitions
removed in the National Gallery of Art space to afford a large
room for better view of your exhibits.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) H. Wetmore,

Assistant Secretary.

SMITHSONIAN

C 32 Y

CAPITAL BUILDING COMPANY
1505 North Capitol Street
Washington, D. C.

Date: January 10, 1932.

Sold to: National Sculpture
Society.
Address: New York City.

To removing and packing 14 mural paintings from
wall at National Museum, as per agreement with
Mr. Adolph Weisman.

\$800.00

EXHIBIT 2-1

OFFICES & FACTORY
1531-2
UNIVERSITY & 23RD STREETS
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
PHONE UNIVERSITY 1531-2

Claude Neon Lights

OF MARYLAND
INCORPORATED

BALTIMORE, MD. December 22, 1932

Senator Millard E. Tydings,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings:

With further reference to our recent correspondence on the subject of sign permits refused on account of the District of Columbia Art Commission, respectfully advise that the George Washington Inn permits were received this week and now the only obstacle to the installation is from the purchaser, who alleges non-performance by us, owing to the long delay, but doubtless this can be straightened out.

The permit for the Mott Theatre sign, the Liberty Theatre Company, also is no longer a live item, since the purchaser claims inability and unwillingness to pay under present conditions and the installation on this Negro movie house.

The third instance referred to you and from which we still seek relief is that of the Canton Pagoda Restaurant, 1343 E. Street N. W., a sign completed by us in our shop now for approximately ten months and which we have been unable to install owing to refusal of the District Commissioners to assure permits, alleging non-approval of the Art Commission.

In this matter of the Canton Pagoda sign we submit this brief:

On this building at present there are two large signs of the old blue and white enamel type with exposed lamps installed by the Federal Electric Company many years ago and still in service. One of these is a vertical projecting sign; the other is of the belt type across the face of the building. The effective sign area in these two signs is approximately 100 square feet and as a condition to the installation of our new sign which is a vertical double face type size 13' 2" x 3' 6" maximum dimensions: These old signs are to be removed so that the new sign area on the building, if we are permitted to make this installation will be substantially less than half the signs area now in place and in service.

Further our sign is a strictly modern artistic and beautiful display, whereas the signs now in place are obsolete and far from artistic.



Senator Millard E. Tydings

#2

December 22, 1932

It would seem to us that this installation is worthy of an exception from the strict rule covered in the copy of the law which you recently sent us, for after all this is a case of replacement and not a case of signs on a property not previously carrying signs, and to deny the owners of this restaurant the right to modernize their electrical display advertising, particularly in view of the fact that they are cutting the size of the display in less than half, seems to us unfair and would be working a hardship not only on the purchasers operating this old established restaurant, but also upon us as our investment to date in this finished sign is approximately \$750.00, all of which we will have to write off to loss, if we are not permitted to erect the sign, not to mention a deferred profit in the contract which we could and would realize over the three year period for which it is written of some three or four hundred dollars, since the contract totals for the period \$1710.00, which, however, includes complete maintenance of the display by us for the three years, including keeping it in burning condition, quarterly cleaning and annual repainting, so that the display is therefore assured of being a creditable one to the purchaser and to the neighborhood.

If you will be good enough to forward this brief and request for relief to the Fine Arts Commission where we are quite sure it will receive attention coming from you and believe that their sense of justice may result in a waiver of the strictest interpretation of the law, which will allow us to carry through this installation within the next thirty days, which is the limit placed on us by the purchaser.

With best Compliments of the Season and thanking you for your cooperation in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

NAH:G

Opeskie
President

CLAUDE NEON LIGHTS OF MD., INC.

January 9, 1933.

My dear Senator Tydings:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 6, gave serious consideration to your courteous letter of December 23, 1932. The Commission directed me to explain to you their action in regard to the sign proposed to be erected by the Claude Neon Lights of Maryland at 1343 E Street, N. W.

Congress by the Act of May 10, 1900, now familiarly known as the Shipstead-Luce Act imposed upon the Commission of Fine Arts certain control over private buildings facing public buildings and parks in Washington. The declared object of Congress was to restore and preserve the orderly appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue and other like thoroughfares.

One of the fundamental regulations made pursuant to this Act was to forbid the private use by bay-window extensions and signs of Government property in the streets by private interests. This regulation has been strictly enforced by the Commission of Fine Arts. Moreover, the regulation was well known to the Neon Company by reason of repeated and prolonged conferences. Now to permit an infringement of the regulation would be to work detriment to a large number of people who have cooperated with the Commission in the effort to bring about good order on the most historic and prominent thoroughfare in the national capital.

The Commission, therefore, consider that by permitting an exception in this case they would be defeating the intentions of Congress and would be unable to carry out a policy Congress deliberately planned.

The members of the Commission recognize the unfortunate character of the neighboring signs, and look to the future to bring about changes necessary to insure the orderly appearance of the buildings to which they are attached.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Millard E. Tydings,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS
OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Washington, D. C.

December 12, 1932.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Application for Garage at
27th and F Streets, N. W.

My dear Mr. Moore:

In reply to your inquiry of November 29, 1932, it would be possible and legal to prevent the proposed gas station at 27th and F Streets, N. W., from having a direct entrance into the Potomac Parkway; but there seems to be no way that the entrance into the service drive in prolongation of 27th Street, as shown on the plan, can be refused. This service drive was put on the map to serve just this kind of purpose of access to private property along the Parkway and at the same time to keep the interference of such access out of the Parkway Drive itself.

The extension of 27th Street by this service road has, of course, not yet been constructed, and I told these applicants that they would have to depend upon the District Government to build it, as it is a city street proposition of no value to the park at all and for which no funds are available to this office.

Personally I don't feel that a low gasoline station, which is not conspicuously painted and which can be more or less screened from the Parkway, is particularly objectionable. The trouble is their tendency to multiply like rabbits. I have for a long time insisted that there must be some way, by change in the zoning regulations or a restriction in the granting of licenses, to limit the number of gas stations for which permits are issued in any one general locality. While the Commissioners are heartily in accord with the desirability of doing this, they don't seem to have found a legal way to go about it. I should be very glad to have your views and recommendations both on this specific project and on the general subject.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) U. S. Grant Ed, Director.

2 incls.

EXHIBIT G

C O F Y

January 7, 1933.

Dear Mr. Deming:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 6, 1933, gave further consideration to your sketches for a gas station to be built at 27th and F Streets, N. W. The Commission regard the sketches as interesting.

The Commission will give further consideration to the plans after you have submitted them to the Building Inspector.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. W. I. Deming,
808--17th Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G-1



HARVARD UNIVERSITY
THE SCHOOL OF CITY PLANNING



RECEIVED
COMMISSION OF FINANCIAL
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JAN 6 1933
ROBINSON HALL ANNEX
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
NOTED

January 3, 1933

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke
72 West Pondfield Road
Bronxville, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I have your note of December 28th
together with a copy of your letter to Mr. Moore about the
elm trees on the Mall.

I agree of course with everything
that you say. There is an amusing bit of history about this
which perhaps you do not know. Mr. William Delano submitted
his arguments (apparently exactly the document to which you
refer) for incorporation in the records of the National
Capital Park and Planning Commission. On reading this docu-
ment I submitted a reply to each of his points, together with
a letter from Mr. Olmsted. My replies were, I trust, within
the bounds of parliamentary procedure but they were very plainly
spoken and I thought left very few rags to Mr. Delano's arguments.
Anyhow they all went on the records of the Commission and nobody
asked for a recon^{sider}ation of the vote against Mr. William Delano
and favorable to the elms which had been passed at a previous
meeting and which therefore I suppose will now stand.

Sincerely yours,

Henry V. Hubbard

HVH:MFS

H. V. HUBBARD

C O P Y

January 11, 1933.

My dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 6, 1933, gave consideration to your letter of that date with regard to the request made by Mr. Leo Friedlander, sculptor of the groups at the entrance to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, that the time specified in his contract be extended 100 days. Mr. Friedlander's work was delayed for more than four months by the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts that he make certain changes in his model, over and above those which might reasonably be expected in the course of his work on the model.

Mr. Friedlander has the problem of translating a bronze group as originally designed by him into stone. This required especial study and consequent delay. Such delays are unavoidable. The Commission is charged with the duty of securing groups of artistic merit, appropriate to their location. Time is a secondary consideration.

The Commission hereby certifies that the extension of time requested by Mr. Friedlander is reasonable, and for the best interests of the result should be allowed a period of somewhat over 100 days, namely, from September 25, 1931, to January 10, 1933.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I

January 7, 1937.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts on January 6, 1937, examined the plans submitted by you through the Supervising Architect's Office for the crossings of E Street South to connect the north and south buildings of the Agricultural Department.

The main building of the Agricultural Department was so finished as to permit and require a connection with future buildings south of E Street. Several designs were prepared in the Supervising Architect's Office for such connections. As the result of a careful study of these various designs, and of the requirements and conditions connected therewith, the Commission of Fine Arts has reached these conclusions:

First. The Commission agrees with the Office of the Supervising Architect that the connections should be of stone. They should not be of steel or even of bronze. Also they cannot properly use a single arch. They can and should use a double arch.

Secondly. The safety and convenience of pedestrians crossing E Street South between the two portions of the Department make it desirable, even necessary to have "islands" in the street. Each of these two islands may advantageously support a pier needed to carry the connection across the street by double arches.

Therefore, the Commission return the tentative design for a single stone arch as unsatisfactory; and request further study of the submission of plans showing the use of the double arch supported at the center by a pier rising from islands of safety in E Street South.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

Dr. C. G. Abbot, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution,
Mr. Charles Moore, representing the Commission of Fine Arts,
and Miss Katharine W. Rhoades, as provided in Paragraph 4
of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer,
have examined the following objects:

- 1 Armenian Manuscript of the Gospels of
Mark and Luke (imperfect), 9th to
10th century.
- 1 illuminated frontispiece: medallion,
from an Arabic, 14th century, Zoran.
- 1 Chinese makimono painting. Landscape,
by Shen Chou, 1427-1509.
- 2 Chinese makimono paintings:
Narcissus, by Chao Leng-chien,
13th century.
Orchid, by Cheng Ssu-nsiao,
13th-14th century.
- 1 Sassanian silver plate, 8th century.
- 4 pieces of inlaid gold filigree.
Chinese, late 18th century.
- 1 Persian silver ewer, Seljuk period,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of
Art by Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator, and hereby approve the purchase.

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts.

January 6th, 1905.

